

Slavery an Infraction of the Second Great Command.

A

DISCOURSE

DELIVERED AT THE

UNITED SERVICE OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES

IN LOWELL,

ON FAST DAY, APRIL 10th, 1856.

BY O. T. LANPHEAR,
PASTOR OF THE HIGH STREET CHURCH.

LOWELL:
BROWN & MOREY, PRINTERS,
44 Central Street.

1856.

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

A

DISCOURSE

DELIVERED AT THE

UNITED SERVICE OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES

IN LOWELL,

ON FAST DAY, APRIL 10th, 1856.

~~~~~  
BY O. T. LANPHEAR,  
PASTOR OF THE HIGH STREET CHURCH.  
~~~~~

LOWELL:
BROWN & MOREY, PRINTERS,
44 Central Street.

1856.

Slavery in the U.S. - controversial literature, 1856

171703
326,973
L288

LOWELL, APRIL 26th, 1856.

REV. MR. LANPHEAR—*Dear Sir*: So strong a desire has been manifested, in the community, to secure the publication of your discourse on Slavery, which was delivered on Fast Day, in High Street Church, that the members of the Church have appointed a committee to request a copy for the press. Allow us to express, in behalf of the friends of freedom, our sincere hope that you may not believe it to be your duty, to withhold, from the public, so valuable a discourse.

E. BURNAP,
JACOB ROBBINS,
IVERS TAYLOR,
JOSIAH HUBBARD,
JOSEPH H. ELY,
LEONARD KIMBALL,

} Committee appointed
by the Church.

LOWELL, APRIL 28th, 1856.

GENTLEMEN:—The Discourse, a copy of which you have politely solicited for the press, was hastily written, with no object in view further than the occasion on which it was delivered, and of course makes no pretension to literary merit.

It was not so much my endeavor, to say something substantially new—on a subject upon which so much talent has been spent—as to bring up again what has already been well said in a fresh form. At the same time, if, as you are pleased to intimate, a more extensive diffusion of its thoughts can serve the cause of Freedom, though in the humblest degree, I do not feel at liberty to decline your request.

Yours, very truly,

O. T. LANPHEAR.

To Messrs. E. BURNAP,

JACOB ROBBINS, and others.

DISCOURSE.

MATTHEW 22: 39.—“THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF.”

THE *first* and great command, treats of the love men are required to entertain towards God; and the *second*, which treats of the love of man to man, our Saviour declares to be like unto the first.

Love to God and love to men form one, inseparable precept. Each part contains the other by implication, so that we cannot place our affections on the Supreme Being, without at the same time placing them on man; neither can we love a man *truly*, without loving God. “If a man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how shall he love God whom he hath not seen?”

On these two commands hang all there is of Law, and all that was ever proclaimed by prophets, and all the teaching of the Church that is of any worth. Love to God and man is the great problem of which Time is the trial, and Eternity the disclosure — the center of all Natural and Revealed wisdom, to which all other knowledge is only attachment or exposition. Every system of Ethics which does not center here is heathenism. Every system of human Legislation which does not retain the spirit and intent of this command, is not law — it is *outlawry*.

But "who is my neighbor?" In answering this question our Saviour spake a parable by which he extorted the confession from the Jewish lawyer, that even a Samaritan performing an office of kindness to an unfortunate man, was a good neighbor to the sufferer. A Samaritan discharging a notable office of humanity to a Jew, was a good neighbor to him, and consequently similar offices were due from a Jew to a Samaritan. The point of the parable is all the more forcible, when we consider the bitter feeling which these people entertained towards each other. The Jew looked upon the Gentile even, with more favor than he did the apostate Samaritan. But the law, disregarding this antipathy otherwise than to condemn it, declares that these people are neighbors, and bound to fulfil the relation in love. Therefore the distinction of sect, the barriers of nationality, the prejudice of race, and the two aristocracies of Wealth and Learning, have no power to withstand the command. Wherever we find one of the human race, there we find a neighbor, and a brother. The relation is not modified by latitude, or longitude; by any polish or refinement on the part of the civilized, or by any degradation of the barbarian.

In view of this command, Tertulian addressing the Heathen in the name of Christians, says — "We are your brethren in the right of nature, our common mother; we are but several streams issuing from one primitive source; several branches sprouting from the same stock; several stones hewed out of the same quarry; one substance by miraculous efficacy of the Divine benediction diffused, and multiplied."

The exposition of our Saviour and the commentary of the Church Father, is in fact most agreeable to common sense. It meets the demands of Conscience everywhere. We find flashes of the principle in the classics, transient glimmerings of it in the writings of Heathen sages. Aristotle declares that "all men naturally are of kin and friends to each other." Another ancient philosopher observes that — "every man is another *ourself*, therefore he that hates another detests his own most lively picture, and he that harms another injures his own nature."

We do not make these quotations supposing they can give additional weight to Scripture. That of itself is infallible. The citation of human opinion in such a case, only shows the nice adaptation of the truth to human judgment; and the ease with which it is received, shows that the demands of truth cannot be waived on a plea of ignorance. If in man there is by nature a readiness to perceive the Law which is revealed, then we conclude that man was made for the law, and the law was made for man, and because of this mutual constitution the *Law* is all the more *commanding*.

But human depravity, anxious to invent some artful escape from the holiness required, asks — "how *much* must I love my neighbor?" "Thou shalt love thy neighbor *as thyself*;" neither *more*, nor *less*; but "*as thyself*." You have to make the inquiry of your own heart. "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even *so* unto them." If you esteem yourself; if you maintain a good opinion of yourself; if neither misfortune nor any of your known

faults can induce you to despise yourself; then for the same reasons and in the same circumstances, do not despise nor undervalue your neighbor. If you wish for success in your plans, are concerned when any thing threatens your credit, or your pleasure; then learn on these points, what your wishes should be for your neighbor. If disappointments, and disasters distress you; if disgrace throws shades of gloom and depression over your own spirits; then know how to sympathize with your neighbor when he is disappointed, or in disgrace. Let your eagerness in prosecuting your own affairs; your solicitude in preparing for a time of need; and above all, if you are a Christian, let your anxiety to save your soul from sin, show you the measure of solicitude you should feel for your fellow men, in these particulars.

If you do not love to vex yourself, do not vex your neighbor. If you do not expose your own faults, nor put foul constructions upon your own language; then you know just how civil you should be to a neighbor, how tender of his reputation.

In fine, if you love your own Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness; then love the same for all mankind. If you would not be deprived of these rights yourself, do not deprive others of them. *Hating to be a slave*, do not be indifferent while your neighbor is in chains: and if you would resort to any means of self-defence rather than be enslaved, then use all such means in your power to protect the rights of your fellow men, and to ensure the religious liberty of all mankind.

This and nothing less is the direct application of

the command. And here taking up the great subject of the time, and one peculiarly appropriate on a day of humiliation ; I observe that:—

American Slavery ; or the holding of property in man, is a thorough infraction of the second command. And as it disobeys this, so it runs counter to all the teachings of the Scriptures, the Old Testament as well as the New. In proof of this statement the words of our Saviour are sufficient, when he says that on the first and second commands, “hang all the Law and the Prophets.” There are those, however, who profess to believe that Slavery is supported by the Old Testament, both by tacit consent, and by direct provision.

The truth, however, is, that there is nothing in those Scriptures which militates against the Love of a Neighbor. The provisions of patriarchal times, and of the Hebrew Commonwealth, aim to secure the practice of this Love. In the Hebrew Laws the right to hold property in man is unknown. Those who deny this statement, have been led into error by confounding the Hebrew service, with the Egyptian, and other heathen systems of slavery ; or else we can hardly allow of their sincerity. In discussing this point, the terms used in respect to the Hebrew service, whether in the English or other versions, must not be measured by corresponding terms in Grecian and Roman Literature ; but by the Hebrew text, and Hebrew Literature.

Accordingly there is no word in the Hebrew answering to our word—Slavery ; nor is there any phraseology that authorizes the holding of property in man.

The bondage of Egypt differed so widely from anything under the Patriarchs, that the Hebrews were obliged to call it *Egyptian* bondage, or the *hard* bondage, or *cruel* bondage. And so if a Hebrew were to give an account of the various systems of Slavery which make man a chattel, he would borrow the defining term from another tongue, his own language being incompetent. He would speak of Egyptian, Grecian, Roman, and American Slavery—none of them Hebrew, none of them sanctioned by the history of his own people.

The Hebrew word, rendered Servant, comes from a verb which means: *to labor, to work*. The word is found in the passages: “there was not a man *to till* the ground”: “the Lord sent Adam forth *to till* the ground”: “Cain was a *tiller* of the ground”: “six days shalt thou *labor*”; and so generally implying the work which a man does for himself. It is used also signifying the work which a man does for another in consideration of wages and by a stipulation. Sometimes one nation is said to serve, or work for another, but the relation supposes the liberty of those serving to stipulate for wages, and to have a voice in the conditions of service. Sometimes the contract of the Hebrew Servant was for six years, and sometimes the agreement ran till the Jubilee.

The man making such a contract, was said to have “sold himself.” The selling was a voluntary bargain of his own, and the thing sold was his labor—never his person. The poor man selling himself in this way in order to find relief from poverty, might be redeemed from his contract by any of his kindred, or

he might redeem himself, or at any rate the contract could not last longer than till the Jubilee.

These contracts were based on the idea of mercy to the poor, and were to be undertaken as an act of benevolence by their employers. At the expiration of the term of service, it was possible for the servant to have secured a comfortable independence, however poor at the time the contract was made. At the expiration of six years of service the Hebrew servant was to receive from his employer a parting gift. His employer was expressly directed "to furnish him liberally out of the flock, the floor, and the winepress." This was an outfit upon which he might go into business for himself.

There were servants also hired by the year. Guarding against the liabilities of abuse on the part of the master or employer, in these contracts we find this specification—"If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bondservant, but as an hired servant and as a sojourner shall he be with thee." All the Hebrew servants so bought, were merely servants on hire, by no means producing the condition which we call slavery.

The term, *bond-man*, comes from the same word in the original, already referred to, so that the same word is rendered by our translators sometimes servant and sometimes bond-man according as the context, or the circumstances of the case may require. The peculiar meaning of *bondman* is determined by reference to the bondage of Egypt, that being the ultimate standard of rigor, cruelty, and oppression.

The Hebrews having no separate word for Egyptian slavery, were obliged to use for it a word of free and honorable origin with such modifications of context as should best present the idea. Such is the use of the word when it is said; "thou shalt not compel thy brother to serve as a bond-servant." "Remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt"—thou shalt not compel thy brother to serve as *such* a bondman.

The Hebrews had a bond-service, but it was not like the Egyptian. In executing the judgments of God against the nations expelled from the promised land, they were commanded to put the remnant of those nations to tribute and service; but they were at the same time forbidden to treat *them*, as they themselves had been treated in Egypt. The system under which these servants were brought was under such restrictions that what we call slavery could never grow out of it; but would on the contrary be abolished by it.

The Hebrews might buy also the servants of heathen masters, and make them their own, but aside from the benevolent law of Jubilee such purchase and adoption was an appointed redemption from a worse state. There could be no injustice under this especial revealed will of God, in purchasing the servants of Heathen masters held by them as slaves; for it brought them out from an irresponsible, absolute slavery, into a system of guardianship and protection which was finally to end in freedom. These servants came under the protection of the same laws against cruelty, were in the same relation to the Church by circumcision, participated in the religious festivals,

privileges of instruction, and worship. The Sabbath, and the Sabbatical year was theirs as well as their masters, while we must always recollect that the *Jubilee was a limit beyond which no form of servitude, or period of bondage could in any case be continued.* Then, all were free, and new engagements could be made at pleasure.

Again, the penalties for cruel and oppressive treatment on the part of masters was the same whether the servants were of Heathen or Hebrew extraction. Every injury must be avenged. For the loss of an eye or a tooth, the servant must be discharged from the contract with his master, whatever the amount of unfulfilled service, or whatever the character of the contract. The Law reads—"Ye shall have one manner of Law as well for the stranger as for one of your own country, for I am the Lord your God."

It is easy to see that the condition of American Slavery would be impossible on these provisions; but we have yet a stronger barrier in the following Law: "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." Man-stealing is the foundation of slavery in all ages. This prevented, the system must cease. But with the Hebrews, the stealing, the selling, and the holding of a man as property was, death. Whether the kidnapper keep or sell his victim, the penalty was the same. The purchaser with knowledge of the theft, was treated as a principal in the crime. The Law effectually prevents any traffic in human beings, and denies the right of property in man. This is made more evident when we find that the theft of what the

Law considered property was punished only by a fine—"If a man shall steal an ox or a sheep and kill it or sell it, he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep." Accordingly if servants had been rated as property, then for stealing a servant, the culprit must have restored five servants for a servant, as in the case of five oxen for an ox. This striking contrast between the two crimes, must have prevented any idea of property in servants. It is remarkable that the scriptures make no mention of traffic in human beings, without describing it as a crime with the wrath of God threatening it. It is spoken of as the damning trade of Tyre and Zidon, of the heathen and Grecians; while every approximation to it through the apostacy or disobedience of Israel is marked with the Divine displeasure. The life, too, of the servant, was under the same protection as that of his master—"He that smiteth a man so that he die, shall surely be put to death." The person slain might be a Hebrew, a Gentile, or a servant. He that killeth *any* man shall surely be put to death. Ye shall have one manner of Law as well for the stranger as for one of your own country.

The curse upon Canaan is often quoted by the advocates of Slavery, but a faithful rendering of it could not make Servants of his descendents in any other sense than as already stated, even if Canaan's descendents could now be recognized and the party they were to serve identified.

It has been said that the Gibeonites at the time of the conquest were made "hewers of wood and drawers of water," which probably means that they were

Slaves. But the careful reader will observe that the Gibeonites were appointed to a sacred service, consecrated to serve at the altar, as waiters of the priests; that their consecration to this service was a boon granted to them instead of death; that their service was the opposite of ignoble; that their rights were preserved to them by especial treaty, the first infraction of which by Saul was avenged in a terrible manner, while God continued to protect them.

No doubt there may have been instances of the abuse of servants and hired help in patriarchal times and under the Hebrew polity as well as under any other regime; but these furnish no support of Slavery so long as they were outrages against Law, and established custom.

Hagar, for example, was "hardly dealt with" by her mistress; but the historic connexions of that transaction show that it was marked with the Divine displeasure in the miraculous sympathy for Hagar, her abuse being consequent upon her mistress' lack of faith and disobedience. Instances of this sort no more support Slavery, than the matter of David with Uriah, goes to license murder, and the universal breach of the seventh commandment.

In these cursory statements enough has been said to show that the Rule of patriarchs, the Law and the Prophets hang on the Great command of Love according to Christ's declaration. As an institution of privilege to the poor, the poor man might sell his labor by the year, or for six years, or until the Jubilee; thereby not only escaping the sufferings of poverty, but also acquiring an independence at the expiration of the term of service.

Also, as an act of love to a Heathen neighbor, the Hebrew might buy the Slave of a Heathen master, and emancipating him from Slavery bring him into his own family under the humane rules of Hebrew labor, till he should at length become in the fullest sense a freeman. This was in fact buying Heathen Slaves to make them free. The same clemency and neighborly Love is illustrated by every direction and precept of the Hebrew system. That system was originated to prevent, in the most effective manner, all those encroachments and oppressions which the rich are so apt to make on the poor.

If we compare American Slavery with Hebrew service we find the contrast broad and unmistakeable. The former declares man a chattel, whereas, the Hebrew has neither word nor phrase of its own capable of expressing such an idea. The Hebrew Servant stipulated for wages, and designated the time of service; but the Slave labors without any such power, by compulsion, and with no coming Jubilee to instil hope or assuage fear. The Jewish code punished the man-stealer with death, but the American code sanctions man-stealing from Africa, in case it does no damage to the traffic between the States. If a Jewish laborer lost an eye, or a tooth, at the hand of his employer, the contract which bound him was from that time void—a statute which if entered in the American code would give speedy emancipation.

In the Jewish polity, if a man should smite his Servant so that he died, he must pay the forfeit with his own life; but in the United States the life of the Slave is at the caprice of the most abandoned of man-

kind, and taken with as little feeling as that of the brute. In Jewry there was a Law forbidding the delivery of a fugitive Servant to his master; but in this country there is a Bill which requires the return of the fugitive Slave in spite of Christian philanthropy, and the horrors that await his return. In the Old Testament system of service, the institution of marriage was inviolable, and the Jewish lineage kept pure from the admixture of foreign blood; but the American institution allows of a state of things too immodest and foul for public recital; a degradation worse than barbarism; such hardness in crime that the Slave-owner without compunction increases and sells his illicit offspring to the highest bidder, as though it were a laudable mode of gain. In fine, had Satan assembled his compeers in the council chambers of Hell, to devise the most finished contradiction to the Jewish polity, he could not have succeeded more to his mind than by the inauguration of American Slavery.

It is remarkable that any other opinion should ever have been tolerated. The system is abhorrent even to the teachings of Natural Theology, to say nothing of Revealed Religion. Even throwing away our Bible, and resting in the precepts of Heathen moralists, we must be abolitionists. Four hundred years before the Christian Era, we find Alcidimas discoursing upon human rights, in such a way as to destroy every vestige of this institution; uttering sentiments which if spoken at the South, would send the speaker to jail, or deliver him to the violence of the mob. This Grecian philosopher declared that, "All men

come free from the hands of God, and that Nature has made no man a Slave." Philemon, another writer, of the same date, says, "Though he is a Slave, yet he has the same nature with ourselves; for no one was ever born a Slave, though his body by misfortune may be brought into subjection." Aristotle, in his *Politeia*, observes that "many writers consider Slavery as an institution altogether unnatural, resulting from the cruel maxims of war. Liberty, they assert, is the great law of nature, which acknowledges not any difference between the master and the Slave; Slavery is therefore unjust, being founded in violence." These sentiments find a response in the Republic of Plato, and the philosophy of Socrates. Indeed, since the Colporteurs of the South must carry expurgated editions of religious works, it is but natural to expect that they will very soon require expurgated editions of the classics, and perhaps a "*Catholic spirit*" in the domain of Letters, as well as in Religion, may yet require the North to form some organization with the view to prepare such editions.

Again, five hundred years before Christ, Confucius, the Chinese philosopher, gave a new religion to his countrymen in which he laid down this remarkable precept:—

"*What you yourself desire not, do not to men*"—

A precept which seems almost an echo of the text, and thought by some to be equivalent to our Saviour's Golden Rule, and which, if obeyed, would banish Slavery from the earth.

If we turn from Heathen to Christian Ethics and the maxims of civilization, the testimony is cumulative and overpowering.

It was the modest, the retiring, but studious Burlamaque, whose familiarity with all the illustrious masters of antiquity, and whose keen sense of the close alliance between religion and politics obliged him to say in his masterly work on the principles of Law, that:—

“Reason informs us that creatures born with the same faculties have an equal and common Right. We are therefore obliged to consider ourselves as naturally equal, and to behave as such—and it would be bidding defiance to nature not to acknowledge this principle of Equity—to have the same dispositions in regard to other men, as we desire they should have towards us; and to behave in the same manner towards them, as we are willing they should behave towards us.”

It was Blackstone who declared “Slavery *anywhere*, repugnant to reason, and the principles of natural Law.”

“The state of Slavery,” said Lord Mansfield, “is of such a nature that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons, moral or political.”

William Whewell, the ablest writer of our times on Moral Science and Polity, says that “Slavery is contrary to the fundamental principles of Morality. It neglects the great primary distinction between persons and things, converting a person into a thing. In the eye of Morality all men are Brothers; and the crime of maintaining Slavery is the crime of making or keeping a Brother a Slave. Whenever Slavery exists, its abolition must be one of the great objects of every good man.”

Coleridge makes this precise statement. "By a principle essential to Christianity a *person* is eternally differenced from a thing; so that the idea of a human Being, necessarily excludes the idea of property in that Being."

If we turn to theologians we shall find among the great names adhering to these sentiments, Wesley, Calvin, Baxter, Samuel Hopkins, and the younger Edwards.

This quotation of opinion swells in magnitude and importance, when we canvass the sentiments often expressed on Southern soil. The Supreme Court of Mississippi once declared, that: "Slavery is condemned by reason, and the Laws of Nature." Adopting the same principle, the Supreme Court of Kentucky has said, that: "Slavery is without foundation in the Law of Nature, or the unwritten and common Law."

Jefferson condemned Slavery — Patrick Henry, though a Slaveholder, said, "*I will not, I cannot justify it.*" Pinckney branded it "as iniquitous and most dishonorable, founded in a disgraceful traffic, shameful in its continuance as in its origin—and by the eternal principles of natural justice no master has a right to hold his Slave in bondage a single hour."

In 1820, before the South and some of the North had grown wise enough to vindicate this institution as a Right, and before conscience had become so deeply seared, we find Mr. Reid, of Georgia, saying: "Slavery is an unnatural state, a dark cloud which obscures half the lustre of our free institutions"—McLane, of Delaware, saying: "I am an enemy of

Slavery, and a Lover of Liberty"—Jones, of Tennessee, declaring that "his wishes would break the fetters of the unfortunate Slave, and loose every chain"—and lastly, Scott, of *Missouri*, said: "Were this an original question, whether we should subject a portion of our fellow beings to a state of servitude, the people of *Missouri* would be among the *first* to declare *against* the principle." This was, of course, before the days of Kansas and the troubles of the Border.

Again, in 1826, when the accomplished Everett, in a mean speech declared his opinion that "Slavery was not an immoral or irreligious relation"—he was told by Mitchel, of Tennessee, that "Slavery was a *curse* in any shape." Another member of the House intimated that, if that gentleman believed what he said, "he ought not to have made the declaration there; he should have gone to the Market place of Constantinople and preached his doctrines to the rattling chains of the wretched captives, and then laid his forehead upon the footstool of the Sultan, and besought him to place his foot upon his neck as the recreant citizen of a recreant Republic." And finally, that master of Invective, John Randolph, arose, and pointing his finger, and darting his scorn, said—"Sir, I envy neither the *head* nor the *heart* of that man from the North who rises here to defend Slavery upon *principle*." If, at this moment, a "*petition of three thousand ministers*" had been presented, it may be doubted whether, while writhing under this castigation, that gentleman would have made such a tame apology for the petitioners, as that which graces our later annals.

In all these quotations, and in the light of History, we see that the great Law of Love to a Neighbor is universally reflected in the Conscience. We see how it issues judgment against Slavery because it subverts this great principle of rectitude, which Heathen Sages, Poets, Orators, modern Civilians, Divines, and Slaveholders themselves agree in acknowledging.

And I wish to observe here, that American Slavery, at the present moment, instead of having any redeeming qualities as compared with other systems in History, is the climax of all cruelty ever before enacted. If, in the ages of History, Slavery in the general is condemned by the second commandment, and by the citation of opinion, then the condemnation of the system in the United States by these authorities is most emphatic, because this system is most heinous.

This will be seen in the instance of a few parallels. Heathen Rome declared that no man was a Slave by nature, but just now in Christian America we have some theologians, and statesmen, claiming that the system is of Divine Right.

Severe as Roman Slavery was under Adrian and Antoninus Pius, it was determined by legal enactment, that any one who should of his own will put a Slave to death, should be liable to the same punishment as if he had taken the life of any other person ; and, that Slaves who had sought refuge in a Sanctuary from the excessive severity of a master, could not be brought back by force, but the master was compelled to sell them—but in enlightened America the Slave may be murdered in the most atrocious forms, with im-

punity ; and instead of a sanctuary of refuge provided for the abused fugitive by enactment, and enforced, there is the trained bloodhound, to—"go seek," and the Fugitive Slave Bill, to overtake.

In the enslavement of the Indians, which followed the conquest of Peru, it was enacted—"that the Indians should not be compelled to labor where they did not choose. It was also decreed that where proprietors had been guilty of a notorious abuse of their Slaves, their estates should be forfeited altogether." If such provisions were found in the statute books of the South, the Slaves would become comparatively free.

In the middle of the sixteenth century we find the Audience of Peru under the administration of Gasca declaring that Slavery in its odious sense was no longer tolerated, and that every Indian vassal might aspire to the rank of a freeman ; but now, in the middle of the 19th century, our Congress, under the administration of Pierce, is trying to rivet the chains which Gasca loosened.

Under the old and severe Monarchy of Castile, the Slavery of the Visigoths lost most of its revolting features, by the light of *Popish* Ethics ; but now, under certain schools of professed *Christian* Ethics the details of American Slavery grow every day more and more revolting. Under the despotic rule of Russia, the Slavery of the Serfs cannot travel into newly acquired territory, but the United States have flung open all their territory to the peculiar institution.

There are startling parallels of sentiment as well as

of legislation, going to show the strength of the system. The opinions put forth in certain quarters by pro-Slavery Christians and apologists, look strangely, in contrast with the sentiments and opinions originating in what are currently understood to have been darker ages than ours. For instance, Las-Casas, the Romish Missionary to the Aztecs, in the time of Cortez, becoming disgusted with Slavery, both negro and Indian, went on an embassy to Charles the Fifth, which he closed in these words:—

“The Christian religion is equal in its operations, and is accommodated to every nation on the globe. It robs no one of his freedom, violates none of his inherent rights, and therefore it well becomes your Majesty to banish so monstrous an oppression as Slavery from your kingdoms in the beginning of your reign, that the Almighty may make it long and prosperous.” But while this *Popish* Missionary labored with this sentiment, a *Protestant* Missionary of Africa has just written a letter quoted by the religious press, in which he mourns because the resident Africans have not the exalted privileges which they would enjoy if transferred into American Slavery, and we have some Names graced with Academic and Ecclesiastical titles ready to endorse this generous sympathy.

Cortez, a name which annalists have clothed with garments rolled in blood in the conquest of Mexico, had nevertheless some anxiety for the spiritual welfare of the Indian Slaves, and accordingly requested the Emperor to send out holy men; “not bishops and pampered prelates who too often squandered the

substance of the church in riotous living ; but godly persons, whose lives might be a fit commentary on their teaching." "Thus only" says Cortez — and the remark is worthy of notice — "can they exercise any influence over the Natives who have been accustomed to see the least departure from morals in their priesthood, punished with the utmost rigor." This philanthropy of the bloody man contrasts strangely with the policy of the Tract Society, cutting out the reproofs of the sins of Slavery in her reprint of authors, and declining to circulate any appropriate illustration of the ten commandments, lest it shall enlighten the Slave, and provoke the master. Dearly as I love this Institution, if this policy must continue, I have no hesitation in saying that I like the notions of Cortez the best.

Again, I find this old warrior had scruples of conscience about Slavery. In his will, executed at Seville, Oct. 11, 1547, he says: "It has long been a question whether one can conscientiously hold property in Indian Slaves, and I enjoin it upon my son Martin and his heirs, that they spare no pains to come to an exact knowledge of the truth, as a matter that deeply concerns their conscience no less than mine." Cortez had scruples of conscience ; but three centuries later we find a "Northern Presbyter," at the head of a noble college on the banks of the Connecticut, pretending to show by sober argument that Slavery is a Divine Institution ; and of course there need be no scruples of conscience in that behalf. Much as I venerate that eminent man, duty to my own conscience and profession, compel me to say that

in this instance, I like best the *head* and the *conscience* of the Spanish warrior at Seville.

Isabella's great Cardinal, Ximenes, the extender and refiner of the Spanish Inquisition, with all his bigotry and moral obliquity, saw that Slavery was wrong, and instead of apology, he exerted himself to ameliorate and destroy it. Such a fact, in the history of such a man, forms a curious parallel with the opinions of all that class who are pleased to express themselves under the title of "South Side Views." On this subject my sympathies side with the Cardinal.

It is said that at the time of the Discovery there was a Spanish casuist, who founded the right of his nation to enslave the Indians, on their smoking tobacco, and not trimming their beards after the Spanish fashion; but that subtle Spaniard is outdone in casuistry by the policy of a certain Institution which to-day publishes tracts against tobacco, but disdains all moral obligation to publish anything against the Licentiousness of Slavery; and again the Spaniard is outdone by those sections of our religious press which during the past year have been awfully grieved about clerical beards, but at the same time have found no cause for declamation against holding men in chains.

In the seventh century, notwithstanding the drawing on of the Dark Ages, it is related that St. Bevon one day after his conversion, meeting a man who had formerly been his slave, whom he had abused, but whom he had liberated on becoming a christian, he fell down at this man's feet, confessed his sin, and besought forgiveness. This conduct of St. Bevon is

truly startling, when compared with that of the Godly Presbyterian Elder of the South, who chains his coachman to the wheel before the church door, and then walks in to distribute to his fellow communicants the body and blood of the Lord Jesus.

The Satirist who would sting this institution with his invective, and wilt down its apologists with irony, and shame those indifferent to its wrongs, with vituperation, does not need to strain his vocabulary in the formation of cutting epithets or wiry illustrations. The sober but crushing antitheses of History, and the citations of opinion are more severe than any such rhetorical invention. When men of age, talent, and position, lend their support to this evil, it is certainly modest and courteous to reply by quoting the opinions of other men, as noble, as learned, and as reverend as they.

For my part, if any third or fifth rate civilian shall take upon him to blame the pulpit for being an agitator because it cries out against oppression, I have only to refer him to the text books of his own profession. Let his own authors on the Spirit of Laws frown on his simplicity; let the books on the shelves of his own Library scowl back the retort. If a pro-Slavery or heartless press is troubled on this point, let it learn the cause which the pulpit has for speaking from the recorded opinions of even Southern statesmen. If the scholar, the christian, and the theologian, is pleased to talk of conservatism on this point, I have no personalities in reply. Let Heathen classics rebuke his scholarship; let Heathen moralists improve his moral philosophy; let the second com-

mand purify his christian creed and profession ; let Confucius, Cortez, and Ximenes, and other Heathen or Popish preceptors have the task of shameing his conservatism, and of converting it to such christian activity as accords with the Love of a Neighbor. Politics in the pulpit ! What a glorious thing if we had anything worthy of the name anywhere, if we had anything but chicanery.

There have been men who considered politics as essentially religious. There have been periods when christian principle, and the christian pulpit had such an influence over and in politics as not to be put to the blush by the superior influence of Heathen moralists on Heathen politics ; when Wordsworth might have been spared the indignant exclamation :—

“ I'd rather be
A Pagan, suckled in a creed outworn.”

There was a time when the character of a politician was not less worthy because infused with moral earnestness, and when religion was not less esteemed because it taught the legislator his responsibility to God. We count it no disparagement to such a man as Lord Bacon, that he wrote theological tracts, and indited most solemn and earnest prayers ; or that such a man as Raleigh composed devotional hymns ; or that Edmund Burke had a serious view of political science, as religious in its spirit, and of Law, as “ prior to all our devices, prior to all our contrivances, and paramount to all our ideas and all our sensations, antecedent to our very existence, by which we are knit and connected in the Eternal frame of the Uni-

verse, and out of which we cannot stir." Burke labored to make politics religious, and to found Government upon a sacred sense of Right. In his estimation politics were something more than the will of man, or the caprice of majorities. His philosophy did not consent, that a majority could pass an Edict having power to contend with a statute of the Almighty, and make itself the Higher Law. He understood that if human law had any power, it was a power which it obtained by its concessions to Divine Law, and that without such concession there could be no valid law of man.

Politics in their true and commanding spirit, instinct with liberty and social elevation, cannot be realized anywhere unless borne up, and infused with this religious spirit. Politics without the spirit of Revelation pervading them, is Heathenism, the undoing of Liberty, and the usurpation of Tyranny. Shall the pulpit be silent therefore? Why, it is this serious spirit, which makes the names of Washington, Jay, and Madison valuable in our political history; and shall the pulpit therefore fail to inculcate this spirit, and cease to recommend it in politics?

It has been said by an able writer that, "if politics ever cease to be a game, if statesmen shall be such in the best sense of the term—not a mere office-holder, or office-seeker, but one in whom the great Idea of a State resides and lives—it will be under that moral discipline which purges away a low and sordid spirit, when men shall imbue their minds and baptize their opinions with the theological spirit." Shall the pulpit therefore betray its high trust by refusing to point

out the connection between politics and theological truth? Shall it cringe and accept the tame and servile position which the Douglasses of our time are pleased to propose?

Paul is quoted by these men as a model, and we like the quotation. He did not try to disorganise Government, or to reform it by the compromise and intrigue which sometimes passes for politics. He said nothing of the duty of the people at the polls; for then the Government was not elective, and the people not making it, were not responsible for it. Had they borne this responsibility, Paul would have charged them to the performance of this—as he did other duties—in righteousness, and to the glory of God. Paul preached the Eternal Doctrines of Right, as opposed to *all* Wrong, whether personal, social, or civil. Heathen Government was founded on Heathen Religion; and the Religion falling, the State must fall. Therefore when Paul preached against Idolatry, when he wrote against Licentiousness, and painted its horrors, and everywhere insisted on the Love of man to man, he advanced doctrines which sapped the foundations of the Heathen State in all its oppressions and unrighteousness. It was because christianity created just this apprehension that the Roman Emperors persecuted it. The fear which led them on was a political fear.

Paul not a political preacher! Let him go South and preach on the Second Command; let him arraign licentiousness in his cutting language to the Corinthians in the audience of both master and slave; let him require the incestuous person to be cut off from

the Church whether the parties be bond or free; let him illustrate these crimes, to say nothing of others, in the spirit of the first chapter of Romans, and see if he would not be *denounced*, and *mobbed*, for making an attack on the Southern Institution. See whether Paul's feet would not be griped as fast in the hampers of a Southern penitentiary, as they were once in the stocks of the inner-prison at Phillipi.

This is the preaching we want, North and South; a pulpit that shall demonstrate the everlasting authority of Moral Right, and Moral Purity, in spite of every bar of man-made law, and foul expediency.

It may be asked in view of these considerations, by what power Slavery to-day demands respect. In spite of the doctrine of the text; condemned by Heathen moralists; outlawed by decisions of the Judiciary on its own soil; under the ban of opinion reared in the midst of its own associations; by what power does it repudiate the rebuke of the Church, soften down remonstrance, create toleration of sentiment, enlarge its area, and increase the number of the enslaved.

The answer is obvious; the power is—*Avarice*.

It has been well said that, "money is the world's power to-day. It rules the State, and settles political questions. It is stronger than religion—stronger than any principle of morality, or political economy. For money, the world's spirit would adopt any government, or any religion." It is not strange, therefore, that as Avarice has been the procuring cause of Slavery in all past History, it should, now, when money is most dominant, support the worst form of Slavery the world ever knew.

Look at History.—It was Avarice in the colonists of Mexico which resisted the anti-Slavery enactments of Spain, and the policy of Cortez.

It was Avarice that flung Peru into commotion, and filled the public squares with tumultuous assemblies, when the ordinance of 1543, declared the Indians free, and loyal vassals of the Crown.

It was the Avarice of English Merchants and of the mercantile interest, which twice prevented English efforts from suppressing the Slavery of Algiers.

It was Avarice in Trade which tried to baffle Wilberforce in the cause of emancipation; and when Mr Pitt in his great speech of 1792, had disarmed the pro-Slavery side of the House of Commons; had turned their own arguments back upon their own heads with crushing emphasis; had driven them from every subterfuge, and created such an impression that the spectators supposed the vote for emancipation would be carried almost by acclamation—then it was that the Avarice of the Slave merchants and the mercantile interest in such towns as Liverpool and Bristol in the advocacy of Mr. Dundas *defeated* emancipation; and held confessed argument, and confessed Right at bay, for sixteen years after Pitts's speech.

It was avarice which brought the Slaves into this country; and sent out Northern ships to transport them for the South.

It was Avarice, which rose up and registered the sordid compromise for Slavery in our Constitution, and that which has sustained it ever since. It never was, and never will be abolished in any instance, unless Avarice can be met, and forced to yield. That

is the thing to be met now, North as well as South. To illustrate this statement.

After the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act, the traveller in Maine, found the people building ships at Camden, Belfast, Searsport, Bucksport, and elsewhere. They were building them for the South, and to carry cotton. Of course they said "don't talk about Slavery; you will touch commerce; our ships will not pay;" and so they held their breath, almost. The ship-owner dare not speak, lest it should damage his investment; the carpenter chipped away on the keels in silence, lest his wages should suffer. The lumbermen had nothing to say, for lumber was their living. The biggest pine in Maine, nodded its lofty head in silence; and all the winds as they swept through the pine forests out as far as the margin of New Brunswick, said, *h-u-s-h! hush!* The pulpit was hush; it was said there were many that wished to speak against the enormity, but from fear, or because troubled to know what was expedient, they kept silence.

What Maine did for the sake of Lumber and Ships, Massachusetts did for the sake of Trade, and Manufactures. Slavery lay off South like a huge serpent, coiled, with his nose pointing North; and whenever he heard his snakeship reviled, he just shot up his head, cocked his eye, and quirling his tail, hissed at Northern Capital, Trade, and Manufactures. The hiss was heard in the Stock-market, and in the Counting-house, making the very Ledgers tremble in their cases. It was audible in the whirl of every spindle, and the vibration of every loom, in the mut-

tering of every waterwheel, and in the whistle of every engine; and rang its menace along the edge of the ship-carpenter's adze. Passing these, the serpents menace went back into the country and troubled the farmer who was afraid his produce would fall in the market if anything touched commerce. No matter whether the menace had any solid foundation; it was feared, and is now feared, and that is sufficient to produce the result.

We talk about corruption in high places, and in the Administration, and it is all too manifest. And yet this is just as good an Administration as the condition and sentiments of the people could give. If popular sentiment—the fountain—were purified, then a better government would flow from it.

The corruption is not all at the Capitol; it pervades this, as well as a warmer latitude; one party as well as another. Southern Avarice seizes, and Northern Avarice helps bind and keep the Slave. It was because "Judas had the bag" that he betrayed his master for "thirty pieces of silver," and it is the bag now, which leads men to betray and sell their neighbors. By this craft we have our wealthy said Diana's silversmiths, as though that were the main argument for worshipping the foul Goddess. Northern Capitalists are now making gain by investments in the Slave trade, on the high seas, as appears in the recent capture of the schooners, Falmouth, and Mary E. Smith. It is stated that about thirty vessels are fitted out annually, at New York, for this traffic.

There is no awful deed, which Avarice will not dare. If the fires of Hell were fed with wood and

coal, and any possibility of transport, Avarice would send in trains freighted with fuel, at all hours, so long as prices were good. The groans of the lost would not touch the iron heart of man, any more than they would wake to compassion the ear of the iron horse. In spite of the suffering abetted, men would claim the inalienable right to supply the infernal domain with the means of torture, employers and employees, all averse to its abolition. What less than this is it, to deal out Alcohol for money, in spite of the horrors brought upon our neighbor, and his family—what less, to keep gambling saloons, and places of debauch, for money—for man to enslave his fellow for money for the Slave-master to hold his criminal *liason*, that he may get money from the sale of his own offspring. This is the thing itself! Whoever makes his neighbor drunk, or a slave, depriving him of prosperity here, and of salvation hereafter, whoever uses these means, or abets them, or fails to rebuke them, does better service for Satan, than any conceivable provisions of fuel.

What has the North, and the Northern Church to do with Slavery! Every thing. Here, possibly, the decisive battle with the avarice that sustains it, is to be fought. Repent for not loving our neighbor in bonds as ourselves lest it should damage our pocket. Repent for making apologies for Slavery here, too gross for the acceptance even of a Southern conscience.

Some talk of abolishing the evil by disunion, just as though Love to a neighbor could be promoted by geographical lines of partition. You might as well

undertake to abolish the unseen pestilence that impregnates the atmosphere, by disunion. Avarice is that pestilence. It moves in the air, and circulates on the pinions of every breeze, across and across all your lines of geographical separation. Depend upon it, if the atmosphere is so saturated with the miasma, that you cannot unite in sending and keeping a delegation in Congress, that shall compete with Southern tactics—too bold to be scared, and too pure to be bought—then you are hopelessly poisoned, and could do nothing by separation.

We say therefore to the North as well as to the South, "*thou art the man.*" If we appoint days of humiliation to mourn over sin, we must at the same time labor to remove the cause of the evil, and attack the sin as it lies at our own door. Love the cause of human Rights, and insist on freedom, even though the means that accomplish the end, should partially, and for a time, interfere with selfish interests. Say with holy fervor, Liberty for our Neighbor, as for Ourselves. Let the anti-Slavery spirit become more of a settled, *religious* conviction; let it be purified of all low and mean expediences; let Right be *Right*, and Wrong be *Wrong* without parley, or preamble. Have faith enough in God to maintain the Right without trembling for consequences; and from a *righteous* dread of consequences fear to tolerate the Wrong. Let the Church awake to a keener perception of principle, a purer devotion, a noble consecration, and the renunciation of Mammon. Let Abolitionism be cleansed of the scurrilities that have attached to it, to take lofty ground—not the loftiness

of declamation—but the exaltation of the soul devout and humble before God, taking its hostility to sin, and its persistence against Wrong from the inspirations of the Holy Spirit.

If we would keep this Fast, we must rend our hearts, and not our garments, and if we will keep this day so, we shall hear the voice of old prophecy, saying :—

“This is the fast that I have chosen :
 To loose the bands of wickedness ;
 To undo the heavy burdens ;
 And to let the oppressed go free ;
 And that ye break every yoke ;
 Bring the poor that are cast out to thy house ;
 And, *hide not thyself from*
Thine own flesh.”